

North Atlantic Division

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. I suggest that the following be added to the Preface, "To be accountable to the Nation for the resources entrusted to the Corps of Engineers". (NADO - AUDIT) [Response: Noted in review of process specific comments.](#)
2. The word audit does not appear in the index. I suggest it be incorporated along with wherever the Distribution Section mentions Financial Manager. Internal Review/Auditing is an integral part of the financial process. (NADO - AUDIT) [Response: Noted in review of process specific comments.](#)
3. There is not a process for DD 1391 certification. (NADO - Military) [Response: Will be referenced in the military specific business process.](#)
4. There is not a process for MILCON reprogramming actions. (NADO - Military) [Response: Will be addressed in the military specific business process.](#)
5. There is not a process for broking work between Divisions. (NADO - Military) [Response: This will be incorporated in the Financial Management Reference document.](#)
6. There is no process for developing and requesting construction funds requests for MILCON projects. (NADO - Military) [Response: Will be referenced under the Military Specific business process.](#)
7. There is no PRB process. (NADO - Military) [Response: The role/responsibilities of the associated with the PRB will be addressed in the Roles/Responsibilities Appendix to the PMBP which is currently under development.](#)
8. There should be a repository of Lessons Learned that can be queried and available to Division/District personnel. (NADO - Military) [Response: This capability will be inherent with P2.](#)
9. The definition of the RMB's role/responsibilities is scattered through the documents. Recommend these be consolidated in one location and show

how the RMB relates to the other process. (NADO - Military) . Response: A Roles/Responsibilities Appendix is currently under development.

10. What is the precise role of the Outreach Coordinator? How is that position funded at the District level? (NADO - Military)Response: The role of the Outreach Coordinator has been deleted from the PMBP.

11. The overall process, as described, will consume the PM's time to the point that his ability to handle multiple projects will be jeopardized. (NADO - Military)Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time for PMs should decrease.

12. The PMBP does not address late design releases, congressional adds, special programs, i.e.: deviations from AR 415-15. (NADO - Military)Response: Addressed in the Military Specific business process..

13. The Desk Manual Index section that addresses the Deputy for Small Business is worded to shut out the Deputy from any meaningful input because it makes that person a singular resource. In reality, the Deputy's resources come from market surveys by program managers, potential sources sought synopsis by CT, and coordination and outreach with contractors and the SBA. I have made preliminary suggested changes that reflect the real process and the process that most likely will achieve the desired results of the small business program. (NADO - Deputy Small Business)Response: Recommended comments were reviewed and applicable responses noted within process specific documents.

14. It would be helpful to include an organization chart showing how the B2/P2 office fits into USACE organization. (NADO - DRM)Response: This office has been renamed and organizational objectives/plans are currently being defined.

15. The BMO is part of the MSC organizational structure. Districts do not have BMOs. Need to establish the link between BMO and district counterparts throughout BP manual. (NADO - DRM) Noted. The PMBP designates the DPW as the District-level link to the BMO at Division level.

16. BP fails to recognize the Resource Management Officer as USACE independent financial management and resource advisor to the Commander on matters relating to corporate financial risk and effective use of resources consistent with the Army Doctrine for financial operations. (NADO - DRM)Response: The PMBP prescribes that all financial management-related issues will be a coordinated effort between the RMO and BMO.

17. Critical to any business plan is the two-way sharing of information. I suggest that the following paragraph be added to the Preface, "Establishes a culture of customer focus."

Communication is critical to project success. We must maintain an awareness of customer perception and expectations on every project. Relationships are built on trust; and that trust comes from open, honest and frequent communications. (NADO - PAO)Response: Noted. Customer focus is addressed in the Communications reference document of the PMBP.

18. The Project Management Business Process Manual documents and institutionalizes USACE's processes through process flowcharting. Its will enhance our ability to perform capacity planning and resource leveling. It appears that the implementation of the PMBP is assured with populating CEFMS databases from PMBP databases. (NADO - PL)Response: Noted. Thank you for your support.

19. Instituting any major new work process can create concerns on the part of the new users, particularly if they were not directly involved in the initial steps in its creation. Therefore, I see the overall purpose of the package to be two-fold: to present and explain the new process, and for Corps of Engineers team, explain where each and everyone fit into the process. (NADO - PL)Response: Noted. Thank you for your support.

20. The need to develop a single workable system for tracking people and expenditures by programs etc. is critical and this package is an essential step in this transformation. To be commended are the efforts to define the system and to adopt an off-the-shelf AIS to serve as a management tool. (NADO - PL)Response: Noted. Thank you for your support.

21. Perhaps the PMBP and P2 could be tried out in one region first before it is applied nation-wide. (NADO - PL) Response: There will be phased implementation of P2.

22. The still to be developed missing pieces for Real Estate and Counsel are an integral part of the process and will need to be reviewed. (NADO - PL) **Response:** Support functionalities will be addressed in Phase II of PMBP/P2 implementation.
23. The manual is too heavy, excessive in detail and overly prescriptive. (NAO) **Response:** The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
24. Focus of manual should be to provide guidance to users, rather than a directive of required processes. There is considerable concern (fear) of how the manual will be applied. Suppresses creativity, as written. (NAO) **Response:** In accordance with ER 5-1-11, all work is covered by a business process. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities.
25. The manual should be available for training, but not as a directive. (NAO) **Response:** In accordance with ER 5-1-11, all work is covered by a business process. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities.
26. The processes are too labor intensive for all projects, especially small projects. (NAO) **Response:** This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required IS dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
27. The training under development for the PMBP is not synchronized with the deployment schedule. (NAO) **Response:** A separate Curriculum Team is developing a comprehensive training program for the PMBP and P2 that will include modules based on web-based or on-line training, CDs, formal classroom training, group discussions, mentoring, etc. to maximize training opportunities at minimum cost.
28. Thoroughly test P2 prior to deployment since this is the engine for the PMBP manual. Implementation of the PMBP Manual and Deployment of P2 and P3e must be staged and layered. (NAO) **Response:** Implementation of the PMBP and deployment of P2 will be phased throughout the Corps.

29. High risk. The manual assumes the software works. (NAO) Response: The document was intended to describe the processes and identify touch points with the P2 system. The full capabilities of P2 will be described as part of the training and on-line tutorial and help screens available when it is deployed.
30. Customer surveys for performance measurement should be addressed in the manual. The processes are inwardly focused and do not serve (provide any measurable benefit to) outside customers. (NAO) Response: The customer is an active member of the PDT. The P2 system will provide the customer with the capability to provide performance measurement feedback, as is currently inherent in the PPDS.
31. Processes should be adjusted to allow the consolidation of small projects at a program level, consistent with the ER. If each small project has to be entered separately, it will not be cost nor time effective. (NAO) Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
32. One-size-fits all approach is inappropriate. It defeats the strength of various aspects of Corps District / Division / Lab diversity. (NAO) Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
33. The processes described will substantially increase the workload of PMs. (NAO) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.

34. The manual prescribes too many boards. Boards don't accomplish projects. PDTs do. Delete all new boards. This manual is not the mechanism to establish new mandates, boards or otherwise. (NAO) Response: The PMBP develops a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work within USACE.
35. Level of effort should not be driven by activity duration as described in XXX. This will inflate resource estimates and disallows real estimates distributed over time. This is a fundamental error in the software and thought process. (NAO) Response: Activity resourcing in P3E will allow for accurate assignment of resource estimates, taking into consideration level of effort, resource calendars, float, etc.
36. This manual describes how we are buying more and more process with scarce resources and leaving less and less for product. Customers (of choice) will not pay more for less. (NAO) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.
37. Process "Initiating a Project in P2" illustrates that the business process is dependent on software rather than finding tools to implement our business process. It makes the Corps software driven and shortens the life of the document. (NAO) Response: The business process is not fundamentally dependent on the software, rather the COTS software applications are being applied to compliment the business processes. Consistent use of the AIS will assure "living" documentation.
38. Process "Initiating a Project in P2" shows that we are expending resources on specific projects prior to receipt of project funds. We need an exception from financial regulations and guidelines. (NAO) Response: This issue is currently being addressed and will be defined in the Financial Management Reference document to the PMBP.
39. This manual appears to present both:
- a. A static business process under ideal conditions, and
 - b. The details necessary for development of software. (NAO) Response: Noted. The business process is not fundamentally dependent on the software, rather the COTS software applications are being applied to compliment the business processes. Consistent use of the AIS will assure "living" documentation.

40. Strongly suggest the minimum mandatory business process features be presented separately from the detailed description. (NAO) Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
41. The process "Receipt of Funds", Activity Preface indicates "P2 will generate PR&Cs information in CEFMS..." We must allow receipt of funds and distribution of funds independently of P2 and P3e. Otherwise, the PM must expend more effort to build multi-layered WBS to get money where it needs to go. The ability to receive and distribute funds for labor independently of P2 and P3e is essential to our "one-stop" Installation Support mission and incompletely defined reimbursable work. (NAO) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.
42. The Advanced Acquisition Planning Board is not necessary. The overall acquisition planning process is already inherent in the duties of Chief Contracting, Deputy for Small Business and DDEPM. The advanced acquisition plan is a living document prepared well in advance and revised at appropriate times to ensure adequate contracting tools and resources to execute assigned missions while meeting other goals. (NAO) Response: Noted. The intent of the PMBP is to develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements.
43. The process has too many separate plans. There should be one plan, the Project Management Plan with provisions that address customer expectations regarding communications, risk, change and quality. (NAO) Response: Noted. The intent of the PMBP is to develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements.
44. The business process related to "Resource Estimate" needs to be structured around what is necessary to effectively execute projects, rather than what is possible by any specific software. (NAO) Response: The process manual describes the capabilities of P2 to assist in resource leveling and workload allocations using the power of the software applications. Certainly other, non-programmable

considerations must also be taken into account before making final resource management decisions.

45. The Business Process is not consistent with the ER for Programs and Project Management. (NAO) Response: Every effort has been made to make the PMBP consistent with ER5-1-11.
46. PMBP Manual should evolve subsequent to required changes resulting from P2 implementation. (NAO) Response: This is a living document and it will be continuously modified as needed.
47. This process appears from this document to be cumbersome. The Project Manager is involved in every aspect (or at least it appears every page) of this document. Granted, I believe it is important to come together as a team in order to get the job done but this is overkill. (NAP) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.
48. Please ensure that all systems work together before deployment to the districts. Working in Contracting, we struggle w/PD2 daily. Initially CEFMS and PD2 did not work together. Don't make the same mistakes in the past w/whatever other systems the Corps anticipates to bring on-line. (NAP) Response: All system interfaces will be thoroughly tested prior to deployment of P2.
49. I tried to review the manual. I gave up. I think I need better GENERAL INFORMATION about what the PMBP is prior to looking at such detailed technical analysis of each process. Maybe this was distributed before, and I missed it. (NAP) Response: The overall process chart is being improved to better portray the linkages and interrelationships among the processes. Ultimately, the PMBP will be available on-line with hot links to facilitate navigation through and among the processes.
50. Future Comments - The District needs a P3e leader to coordinate the entire P3e system. Without this individual, P3e will not be the useful tool it needs to be to keep this District running. (NAP) Response: P3e training is currently being coordinated within each command.

51. The District's supervisors need to be explained their new role under PMBP. I don't think they realize how their role will be changed in dealing with the PDT. (NAP) [Response: A Roles/Responsibilities Appendix to the PMBP is currently being developed.](#)
52. Implementation Guidance is too detailed; Review period too short. (NAP) [Response: Noted.](#)
53. One of the Chief's comments in his introductory video to the PMBP Manual was that he expected managers to create an "environment for success." The P2 information system and associated processes will create a data intensive environment, where the PMs and PDT members spend inordinate time maintaining management information systems and will get little in return for their effort. Management will still have to make decisions based on judgment and experience rather than automated processes and reports. These processes have oversimplified and overlooked the issues that we deal with on a daily basis. (NAN) [Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects. Management will, of course, need to make decisions taking into account judgement and experience as well as the data made available by the automated system and standardized processes.](#)
54. Manual uses P2 as its engine. P2 should be field tested prior to its implementation to ensure that it is:
- a. User friendly.
 - b. Requires minimum PM and PDT input.
 - c. Info is easily retrieved by PM and PDT.
 - d. Is adequate for upward reporting.
 - e. All USACE members will be given the opportunity to provide input prior to its implementation.
 - f. Corps information system must be able to directly interface with Army wide information systems, i.e., Army Integrated Facilities System (IFS), 1391 process etc.

- g. Ensure that the generated data achieves its intended purpose. (NAN)
Response: Several System Development Labs (SDLs) are scheduled prior to deployment of P2 to ensure all of the above.
55. PMBP manual should not be finalized without a second round of comments to ensure that P2 adequately interfaces with the manual. The process relies heavily on P2. Implementing the process without it is unreasonable. (NAN) Response: The business process is not fundamentally dependent on the software, rather the COTS software applications are being applied to compliment the business processes. Consistent use of the AIS will assure "living" documentation.
56. Cost of Implementation will be borne by a higher cost to our customer or a decreased level of effort in product development. The cost of the process may well exceed the cost of the product. The costs for implementation are not offset by purported benefits. (NAN) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.
57. The processes are oriented toward tracking of the processes and an unrealistic attempt to eliminate all risk. This results in the process becoming more important than the product. We should ask ourselves if our goal is to produce documentation or to improve our nation's civil and military infrastructure. (NAN) Response: The goal of the PMBP is to standardize common processes so that corporate data needs and regional business center objectives of USACE can be satisfied at the least cost and intrusion to normal PDT activities.
58. The PMBP Manual is very limited in that it deals almost exclusively with the PM-PDT layer. It virtually excludes the vertical team, both within the District (the relationship and processes between the PM/PDT and the MLM, PRB and CAB) and between the District and Division and HQ. Defining the business processes, especially between the District and higher authority is a key to success. (NAN) Response: The PMBP has purposefully concentrated to date on project execution and the PDT, but does include some vertical team processes in important areas. Further development of the processes in the future may include more vertical team-specific processes, however, in the interest of keeping the manual from becoming completely unwieldy, not all vertical team and chain-of-command processes can be included.

59. To ensure that the PMBP manual is effectively embraced and used by all it should be user-friendly and designed for a wide range of PDT members' capabilities, experience and training. Retooling of the current manual is required to achieve this goal. (NAN) *Response: When deployed, P2 will include user-friendly links to the processes, screen shots, help screens and attached/linked documentation to assist all PDT members according to the role they play in the processes.*
60. Districts must be allowed flexibility in business processes and documents to accomplish their specific mission. Do not concur in "one size fits all" approach. (NAN) *Response: The goal of the PMBP is to standardize "just enough" to satisfy corporate data needs, while still retaining flexibility at the District and PDT levels. The processes are not intended to be completely prescriptive, but rather like doctrine, with the PDTs establishing additional practices and procedures that meet the spirit of the PMBP within the context of the District organization.*
61. The processes and their respective responsibilities require functions/plans/documentation that the District currently does not perform. In order to perform those functions, additional resources and possibly organizational changes will be required by the District. (NAN) *Response: The processes are not intended to be completely prescriptive, but rather like doctrine, with the PDTs establishing additional practices and procedures that meet the spirit of the PMBP within the context of the District organization.*
62. The manual appears to rely heavily on P2 labor data analyses for resource leveling and workload allocations especially by the RMB. This is an overly simplistic way to manage resources. There are many intangibles in determining whether a District has the resources to manage a project/workload. All staff hours are not the same. All projects are not the same. Each brings to the table a different mix of time demands, customer issues, and staff skills required to successfully accomplish the project. It is a mistake to rely so heavily on what is essentially pure labor data in making these types of resource management decisions, and the manual needs to recognize that this is only one part of a decision-making process, which it doesn't. Discussion of project/program capabilities, District staff flexibilities and customer expectations with the Districts (and within the Districts) are also an important part of resource management decision-making. (NAN) *Response: The process manual describes the capabilities of P2 to assist in resource leveling and workload allocations using the power of the software applications. Certainly other, non-programmable considerations must also be taken into account before making final resource management decisions.*

63. Capability for new work should be a district decision based on P2 data and management input, which is not how the process works in the manual. Prior to contracting work out districts should consider using available expertise within the Corps, but not be mandated to do so if they feel it would be impractical or inefficient. (NAN) [Response: The processes do describe how P2 data can be used to make decisions regarding the acceptance of new work, including considerations of local and regional expertise, contracting goals, etc.](#)
64. There are many different boards and offices referred to (e.g., Regional Management Board, Business Management Office). It is not clear which are at the District, Division, or HQ level, the membership, mission, or relationship between boards/offices. (NAN) [Response: A definition of each will be provided in the Glossary and each will be addressed in the Roles/Responsibilities Appendix to the PMBP.](#)
65. The role of a Middle Management Team is not emphasized enough. It should be emphasized that a formal Middle Management Team should be established to provide guidance and assistance to PM's and PDT's in the staffing of PDT's, development of PMP's, resource allocations, and project execution. (NAN) [Response: The PMBP has purposefully concentrated to date on project execution and the PDT, but does not include some vertical team processes in important areas. Further development of the processes in the future may include more vertical team-specific processes.](#)
66. The "master flow chart" is very poorly laid out. The extensive use of double arrows and lack of decision boxes prevent a clear flow. (NAN) [Response: The master flow chart is being improved to more clearly portray the linkages and interactions among the separate processes.](#)
67. The web site with its plethora of hotlinks is confusing to navigate. It is easy to get lost in the references, as they are often and totally separate web sites with their own navigational procedures and issues. Some sort of "home" window should encompass all hot linked references, so that users can easily navigate back to the manual and pick up where they left off. (NAN) [Response: Noted.](#)
68. The ORACLE navigation system is confusing and cumbersome. For example, the template for providing comments does not track with the way the manual is actually laid out. (NAN) [Response: The master flow chart is being improved to more clearly portray the linkages and interactions among the separate processes.](#)

69. Processes lack accounting procedures. Identify funding source for all activities in all processes, e.g., P&D, S&A, DDC or overhead. This will eliminate confusion during budget preparation and ensure standardization across the Corps in accounting procedures. (NAN)

Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities, but does not address specific technical or support functions. Specific technical/support functions are addressed by applicable technical/support guidelines and regulations.

70. This report does not include an accrual section. Please note that as currently defined *everybody* is responsible for accruals. This means, effectively, that *nobody* is. Ultimate responsibility should reside with the portion of the PDT that is controlling the resource. (NAN)

Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities, but does not address specific technical or support functions. Specific technical/support functions are addressed by applicable guidelines and regulations.

71. MISC.

- Project delivery process flowchart - suggest "customer scope definition" be changed to "customer scope clarification" since the scope should have been defined by the customer at the time we accepted the work. Response: Noted.
- "Policy References" do not include titles, only links. Unless someone is familiar with regulation, circular, manual, etc. numbers, it will be difficult to know which reference is most likely to provide information that the reader is interested in. Response: Noted.
- The further use of examples would be useful. Response: Noted.
- Acronyms are frequently employed without being defined. (NAN) Response: All acronyms will be properly defined in the glossary.

72. The manual is not functionally organized, too long to be of a great use to the average PM, and tries to cover too many subjects under one cover. Recommendations would be to organize it along functions (RM, PM, etc.) with appendix for the specifics of how to use the P2 program. Otherwise it could be

broken down by volumes with each one geared more to the functional requirements. (NAU) Response: Every attempt has been made to keep the document as simple as possible, but because the PMBP and P2 must function together, the touch points and linkages needed to be included. When P2 is deployed, additional detailed instructions will be provided on the use of the automated system, including on-line help screens and hot links to the processes to facilitate understanding of the interaction.

73. Speaking of P2, I didn't see it defined anywhere in the manual. I also didn't see any definition of P3e either and CEFMS wasn't defined until page 221. Not everyone that works in the Corps is going to understand what these systems are or what they are used for. (NAU) Response: The glossary has been updated to include definitions for P2 and P3e.
74. It seems that we are going to excessively burdened the project manager with this entire PMBP process, almost to the point that the PM will spend all of his/her time completing/updating the various reports and modules that it will be a wonder when they will get to visit customers and the field. The PM is now responsible for the PMP, the Risk Management Plan, the Lessons Learned, the Activities Scheduling, the Communications Plan, the Change Management Plan, the Quality Management Plan, and I'm sure I've missed some. For a PM that is only working 3-5 projects, it may be possible for the PM to adequately develop these plans and then more importantly, keep them updated as work progresses. However, for the average NAU PM who has a large number of projects of various size and cost, the task is Herculean to say the least. In order to accomplish this work, the districts either need more PMs or develop standard templates for these many and various plans based on project size and scope. I agree completely with the PMBP process but in order to be effective, the district needs the resources to develop these plans and still continue to work aggressively to get additional work. (NAU) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.
75. Executive summary is very weak. It could have been rolled up into the Preface. The summary should specify what the goal of the manual is with a synopsis of the contents and the objectives. (NAU) Response: Noted. This manual is the implementation guidance for ER 5-1-11. Per the Executive Summary, "the PMBP

Manual establishes Corps-wide corporate business processes". It establishes the minimum level of consistency across USACE.

76. The word descriptions and the flow charts were duplicates in most instances. Could significantly reduce the volume by eliminating much of the verbiage under each module and put some extra explanation on the flow chart. Or eliminate the flow charts. (NAU) **Response:** The master flow chart is being improved to more clearly portray the linkages and interactions among the separate processes.
77. The explicitly specified roles for the Commander and the Corporate Board are too limited. From the Desk Manual link on the web page, the Commander's role is limited to a resolution role in Advanced Acquisition Strategy and the objectives/priorities formulation responsibility for the Operating Budget. There is also a reference to the Commander in the PMP Approval Process. Without beating the "Commander is responsible for everything" drum and having the commander role identified in every process, there are some specific processes in which the commander should have a more explicit, direct role: Quality System, Corporate Relations, Command Management Review, the Civil Works Program and Budget Process (particularly with regards to Congressional visits), and, depending on the magnitude of the associated issues, a good number of other processes. Also, there is a role for the commander identified in the Risk Management Plan (IAW AR 385-10) but this is not referenced in the Desk Manual, probably because there is not an identified responsibility in the Responsibility paragraph. Similarly, the Corporate Board has a limited specified role yet they are really the PDT for District Programs. (NAE) **Response:** It is true that the processes cannot possibly attempt to specify every instance where the Commander or any other person or entity plays a role, or to trace every instance of coordination/approval through the vertical team or chain of command. The processes have attempted to highlight the more significant roles that involve the P2 system. The processes are also not meant to be prescriptive. Districts should feel free to adapt and add additional roles and responsibilities as necessary or desirable.
78. Two processes currently lie outside the PMBP that need to be incorporated. The METL development process should result in a set of skills and capabilities that the District will need to maintain or grow. Similarly, the IDP development process identifies requirements for training and development. Both of these inputs need to be considered in the Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling (at the Project {PROC 1014}and Regional Levels) as well as the Team Establishment Process {PROC

1008}. (NAE) Response: Concur. These and other factors that cannot easily be "modeled" within the PMBP or P2 system should be considered as necessary/

79. The Business processes outlined in the Manual are highly dependant on the new Automated Information System, P2. The P2 system has not been fielded so it's difficult to assess how affective it will be in the many roles outlines in the Manual. I am concerned, however, that the Corps has tried, unsuccessfully, on three prior occasions to implement an automated project management system. The failure of these previous systems was largely the result of unrealistic demands placed on the software developers. Simply, the developers were asked to include too many disparate tasks in the system. I would suggest that the implementation of P2 in general and its linkage to the PMBP proceed in phases. I would recommend that P2 be fielded and that the focus be placed on the project management aspects of the system. Once the system is in the field, additional applications in support of the budget development and resource leveling be test prior to adoption into the PMBP Manual. I fear that too much is being asked of an untested system. (NAE)

Response: The business process is not fundamentally dependent on the software, rather the COTS software applications are being applied to compliment the business processes. Consistent use of the AIS will assure "living" documentation. Deployment of P2 will be coordinated through a phased approach.

80. I am concerned with the potential impact that the business process could have on the management costs of small projects such as Continuing Authorities and FPMS/PAS technical assistance studies. The business practices associated with resource leveling will require that all projects be entered into the P2/P3 systems at a level of detail sufficient to outline resource needs in each of the functional areas. It also requires that fairly detailed PMP be developed for projects that currently use either a programmatic or simplified PMP. One of the most difficult challenges we have in meeting customer expectations is keeping the study and management cost to at a reasonable level. These requirements are going to add significant costs to the project and will add to an existing problem. (NAE) Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.

81. In large measure, this Business Process is heavily dependant upon Promis being able to deliver the analytical data and reports on which this process is based. I have no doubts that it will, its just that to some degree you need to envision how things can

and will work in the future, and not necessarily have any current processes from which to make that leap. Currently, we are not very close to the climate of operations that is envisioned in this document. Again though, I don't have a problem with it. (NAE) Response: The business process is not fundamentally dependent on the software, rather the COTS software applications are being applied to compliment the business processes. Consistent use of the AIS will assure "living" documentation.

82. From my experience, we here at NAE are long way from every being able to implement this process. My suggestion is that after this review is over, we had better start figuring out the specifics on how we are ever going to implement any of this stuff. Here's an example of what I'm talking about. The manual outlines a process for approving PMPs. As far as I know, this process has never been defined here at NAE. This is testimony to my point in that we have had the PM process here now for over 10 years and we still can't even figure out how to approve a PMP. Never mind figuring out how we are going set up the process for resourcing a PDT. (NAE) Response: Noted. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities.

83. The manual lays out a lot of responsibilities for the Project Manager. This isn't necessarily a problem, but my concern is that we need to start seriously considering the workload of our Project Managers and how this affects our ability to be responsible for all the items specified in the PMBP Process. If this manual is followed to the letter of the law, than I really don't see how a PM can handle more than a couple of projects regardless of the size of the project. The way we currently do business here in NAE PPMD, we are going to have a difficult time adhering to this process as most of our PMs have quite a few more projects than 2. This is a philosophy thing really, and it comes down to what we expect of our PMs. I can name numerous PMs in NAE who aren't really PMs not because of a lack of skills or abilities, but more because they "manage" a large number of projects. These people aren't really doing Project Management, they are really doing Program Management. I recognize that the Process also covers Program Mgmt to some degree, but we are calling our personnel "Project Managers". These people just do not have the time to adhere to all that is laid out in the manual because of their workload. One thing I'd like to point out is that this issue is not a new one. We here at NAE have never really laid out what we expect of our PMs. All of our PMs do things differently. I think there will always be some differences in the way PMs do things because of style differences, but we need to sit down and figure out what we mean by the term "Project Manager", because everyone throughout the district has a different idea of what it is. (NAE) Response: Noted, however the intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal

PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.

84. Document makes it very clear that the PM is responsible for everything on a project. That is separate from responsibility for completing the task...this document does not make that distinction. For example, 2101's...PM's provide input, but Program Mgt is responsible for formally submitting, not the PM. There are many examples of this throughout the document. (NAE) **Response:** Although the PM is responsible, many activities can and are performed by others. Also keep in mind that with P2, many "submittals" will be eliminated, with the data instead extracted by those that need it via standardized reports and/or queries.
85. Depending on how involved the actual implementation with P2 and P3e is, NAE may need to reduce the number of projects per PM...there's a lot of management of "plans" involved in this new process. That takes significant time...NAE may want to pay close attention to this. I know personally, unless I get help, there's no way I can do all this, and keep my projects moving forward...some of this helps with managing projects, but, a lot of it is still for reporting, etc....not really needed to truly manage a project. (NAE) **Response:** The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.
86. Philosophically, the PMBP presented is a HUGE change in culture for NAE. It appears that the PM portion of the PMBP isn't too different from how we operate today, however, we become much more dependent on other parts of the organization to make our process work. This will be a difficult transition. If a PM can't get a team member because another function has not resource leveled their organization, the process will fail. (NAE) **Response:** Noted. All elements of the organization will need to embrace and use the PMBP and P2 system to achieve success in the most efficient manner.
87. I do have a general comment in that I feel too much is being put onto the Project Team members. They have enough to do to complete the technical tasks on time and within budget, without all the input and updates to P2. I feel the Resource Providers need to be inputting more of this information, letting the team do their technical tasks. This would also assure that all appropriate costs are included in the project, i.e. CADD administration, supervisory, etc. It would also hopefully allow resource providers to level resources prior to assigning team members. (NAE)

Response: The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease. While the PM ultimately remains responsible, it should be a goal for the PDT members, resource providers, and others to eventually input and maintain their own portions of the data in the P2 system and to use the capabilities of the system at the appropriate points in the project and program delivery process.

88. If all District projects are to be included on P2, I feel that costs are going to increase for smaller projects. I see P2 being used in districts that have large Civil Works or MILCON programs, but our program has so many small quick turn-around projects, that I see it being more burdensome than worthwhile. (NAE) Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
89. The process appears to be geared toward large, contracted projects. What about in-house projects? Is the system flexible enough to allow multi-district project teams? Multi-agency teams? (NAE) Response: Yes. The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project.
90. At what level are projects excluded from this process? If the entire effort is \$18K (\$8K? \$80K?), how do we justify to our customers expending significant additional funds to follow the PMBP? (NAE) Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
91. Marketing - who does it? This is a major issue with the technical folks, for most managers do not know what is involved in the discipline (e.g. integrated environmental geophysics), and therefore cannot market their folk's skills. If the marketing role remains with the managers, then they MUST be required in their

TAPES to demonstrate familiarity with their personnel's discipline, professional goals, etc. (NAE) [Response: Will be addressed in the Roles/Responsibilities Appendix to the PMBP.](#)

92. Training is mentioned in the PMBP PowerPoint presentation. I do not see how this training will be accomplished at least one E\P branch, given that many folks can only take 1 course every 6 years given the current budget. (NAE) [Response: A separate Curriculum Team is developing a comprehensive training program for the PMBP and P2 that will include modules based on web-based or on-line training, CDs, formal classroom training, group discussions, mentoring, etc. to maximize training opportunities at minimum cost.](#)

93. I showed my staff the Chief's video and slide show and asked them to review the draft manual. Since my staff is not very familiar with the PM regulations/process, Promise/P2 etc., they found the manual difficult to follow, particularly the flow charts. My major comment deals with the PMP Development and Team Establishment sections. How is it decided which projects will need a PMP and a formal PDT established? Our experience, mainly with navigation maintenance dredging projects, is that PMBP has not been fully implemented and the process is still rather "loose". We are trying to tighten up our part by developing schedules with Carl, but shouldn't the PM have a schedule, a team with stated assignments and commitments by the team members (agreed to by the Resource Managers)? Things are better than they used to be, (thanks Bobby) but if PMBP is going to be fully implemented, it seems like it should apply to the navigation projects. Thanks for the chance to comment. (NAE) [Response: As the Chief has stated, all work is a project and therefore all work should have a PMP, PM assigned, PDT established, etc. However, the requirements of the PMBP need to be tailored to the size and complexity of each project or program so that the intent of the PMBP can be met commensurate with the needs of delivering the project/program to our customers.](#)

94. Not enough time to review this document given the workload. I would have liked to have had the time to really think about what is presented rather than rush through it and provide "off the top of my head" comments. (NAB) [Response: Noted.](#)

95. The hard copy is hard to follow. An easy to follow hard copy is important because with all of the cross referencing, it is easier to follow the process when the various sub processes can be placed side by side rather than flipping through computer screens. (NAB)

[Response: The overall process chart is being improved to better portray the linkages and interrelationships among the processes. Ultimately the PMBP will be available on-line with hot links to facilitate navigation through and among the processes.](#)

96. I'm not clear what is meant by the "Ownership" paragraph and why the ownership is the same for each sub process. (NAB) **Response:** "Ownership" is intended to identify which entity is responsible for the process to ensure that it is updated and maintained over time. The "Ownership" paragraph of each process is being clarified.
97. There should be some discussion regarding how the Chief of Engineers' April 5, 2001 memo regarding the importance of preventive law in the execution of Corps programs and the role of legal review fits into the PMB process. We don't have sufficient time to provide detailed review. (NAB) **Response:** Counsel should be represented on PDTs as necessary and appropriate so that the requirements of legal review are understood and met.
98. I am concerned this document doesn't describe what the capabilities of P2 will be. P2 needs to be a database that is usable by both Project Managers and Resource Managers. (I.e. team leaders, Program Managers, section chiefs, branch chiefs, division chiefs etc...) PROMIS & PPDS currently provide limited useful data for resource managers. P2 should be capable of sorting the data in many many ways to create useful reports for resource managers as well as project managers. (NAB) **Response:** The document was intended to describe the processes and identify touch points with the P2 system. The full capabilities of P2 will be described as part of the training and on-line tutorial and help screens available when it is deployed.
99. I am concerned that embedding Primavera P3e within an Oracle P2 database will negate many of the vast capabilities of the Primavera program. What is USACE doing to make sure this doesn't happen? (NAB) **Response:** P3e will be used to populate appropriate data in an Oracle database so that additional (Oracle) software can be used to access, analyze, query and report on the data. The full capabilities of P3e will be preserved and enhanced.
100. I recommend against inputting schedules to the lowest possible task level. Maintaining the database to this level of accuracy will become extremely difficult and labor intensive. If we go this way we will need to begin hiring professional schedulers to help input our data. I recommend that we seek a balance in the data we input so that we input the right level of data needed for decision makers. (NAB) **Response:** Schedules will need to be resourced to the lowest organizational level to enable meaningful resource leveling and workload analysis. In some cases, resourcing to the individual may be appropriate for limited or special resources.

101. The Primavera scheduling program can be an excellent tool for understanding resourcing needs and leveling workload, if individual project schedules can be merged and sorted with other projects. Doing this requires common coding of tasks between projects. Will P2 be capable of this and if so, how will the common coding be accomplished given that 100's of people will be inputting data? This capability is essential if we want to make P2 a useful tool for resource managers. (NAB) [Response: P2 will be deployed with standardized WBSs, templates, embedded coding, etc. to assure accurate merging and sorting between and among projects and for accurate rollups of data.](#)
102. This document is very unwieldy and a major reason is that it combines instructions on how to use an automated project management system with a description of the PMBP. (NAB) [Response: Every attempt has been made to keep the document as simple as possible, but because the PMBP and P2 must function together, the touch points and linkages needed to be included. When P2 is deployed, additional detailed instructions will be provided on the use of the automated system, including on-line help screens and hot links to the processes to facilitate understanding of the interaction.](#)
103. Manual is VERY difficult to read. (NAB) [Response: Every attempt has been made to keep the document as simple as possible, but because the PMBP and P2 must function together, the touch points and linkages needed to be included. When P2 is deployed, additional detailed instructions will be provided on the use of the automated system, including on-line help screens and hot links to the processes to facilitate understanding of the interaction.](#)
104. Process associated with getting new MOAs in place with new customers is not discussed. (NAB) [Response: A logic check is included to identify whether the customer is "new" and references are included to link to other process requirements.](#)
105. The hard copy is hard to follow. (NAB) [Response: Every attempt has been made to keep the document as simple as possible, but because the PMBP and P2 must function together, the touch points and linkages needed to be included. When P2 is deployed, additional detailed instructions will be provided on the use of the automated system, including on-line help screens and hot links to the processes to facilitate understanding of the interaction.](#)
106. Significant resources and much effort will be expended to implement and maintain the automated systems supporting this PMBP Manual. It is essential that these automated systems not only be user-friendly but that those inputting the

data clearly see the value added to them by inputting this data. That is, these systems and procedures need to help them in doing their own jobs. Successful reduction in upward reporting and utilization of automated budget development components of this system will be a significant start in this direction. However, since much of P2 still seems "under development", the timing of launching this manual needs to be carefully considered so as not to turn folks off. (NAB)

Response: Noted. The intent of the PMBP and the supporting AIS is to facilitate single source data entry, eliminate data calls, and make all upward reporting requirements a byproduct of the normal PM/PDT functions of statusing their projects in the NAS through standardized reports and queries. In that regard, over time, as projects are loaded and maintained in P2, the time (and costs) for PMs should decrease.

107. The manual indicates approval actions by the PRB (in this case review and approval of VTC fact sheets & 2101's). In many cases in NAB, those actions have been delegated (or are routinely performed) at lower levels of the organization. Hopefully, the automated system will allow such delegations. (Another example is approval of PMP's). (NAB) Response: The processes are not intended to be completely prescriptive, but rather like doctrine, with the PDTs and District leadership establishing additional or slightly modified practices and procedures (e.g. delegations of authority or responsibility) that meet the spirit of the PMBP within the context of the District organization.
108. The complexity of this manual could overwhelm many smaller projects. We will need to employ a good deal of common sense on those projects to avoid killing them with communications plans, etc. (NAB) Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.
109. Operating Budget is currently inputted in CEFMS and rates are developed. Is the CEFMS information loaded into P2 or vice versa? Is the P2 a tool to develop the operating budget and then you input into CEFMS? (NAB) Response: CEFMS will continue to be utilized as the Corps' Financial Management System. All Operating Budgets will be input into CEFMS. Project Work Breakdown Schedules of Activities and their associated costs will be developed in P2 and will flow to CEFMS via interface for the creation of applicable Contracting/Labor PR&Cs.

110. How will the O&M and other Operations budgets fit into P2? Currently the budgets are develop by using ABS. (NAB) Responses: O&M processes are currently under development and will be addressed in Phase II of the PMBP/P2 Deployment Plan.

111. FORCON (manpower), 2101s (schedules for execution) and capabilities are addressed very little, if at all, in the manual. Will these systems continue to be used or eventually incorporated into P2? (NAB) Response: Currently under review.